	ll .		
1	lchermle@orrick.com  MICHAEL APARICIO (STATE BAR NO. 206300)		
2			
3	maparicio@orrick.com ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLI	DES DISTRICA	
4	1000 Marsh Road Menlo Park, CA 94025	STATE	
5	Telephone: 650-614-7400 Facsimile: 650-614-7401	IT IS SO ORDERED	
6	Attorneys for Defendant	[7] O mes Mart [3]	
7	INTUIT INC.	Judge James Ware	
8	Daniel J. Burkhart		
9	9473 N. Albatross Drive Tucson, AZ 85742	DISTRICT OF C	
10	(520) 990-3918		
11	Plaintiff, <i>In Pro Per</i>		
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
13			
14	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
15	SAN JOS	E DIVISION	
16	DANIEL I DUDIZILADT	C N- C07 02751 BV	
17	DANIEL J. BURKHART,	Case No. C07 03751 JW	
18	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER FOR DISMISSAL OF	
19	V.	INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS AND TRANSFER OF CASE TO DISTRICT	
20	INTUIT, INC. a corporation and DOE Corporations, 1 through 10; STEPHEN M.	OF ARIZONA, TUCSON DIVISION	
21	BENNETT, an individual; BRAD D. SMITH, an individual; JEAN-PAUL GUILBAULT, an		
22	individual; JENNY PERRY, an individual; LAURA MAULER, an individual; JOHN		
23	DOES 1 through 50, as individuals,,		
24	Defendants.		
25			
26	Plaintiff Daniel J. Burkhart, in pro per, and Defendants Intuit Inc., Stephen M.		
27	Bennett, Brad D. Smith, Jean-Paul Guilbault, Jenny Perry and Laura Mauler, through Orrick,		
28	Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP, appearing specially on their behalf, hereby enter into the following		

Stipulation and ask the Court to enter the Orders listed below.

<u>STIPULATION</u>

Plaintiff Daniel J. Burkhart commenced this action on or about July 20, 2007. Plaintiff has not served the Complaint and Summons on any Defendant.

On or about September 21, 2007, the Court entered an Order granting Plaintiff's petition to proceed *in forma pauperis*, permitting service of process to be executed by the U.S. Marshals Service. It is the Parties' understanding that the Clerk of the Court is awaiting further information from Plaintiff (correct addresses for all defendants) and has not yet directed the Court's service order to the U.S. Marshals Service, and no action has been taken by the U.S. Marshals Service to serve the Complaint upon any of the defendants. <u>See</u> Docket Entry dated 10/09/2007.

Plaintiff and Defendants agree that venue in the Northern District of California is improper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiff's claims occurred in Arizona, and not all defendants live in the same state. Further, the Parties agree that proper venue under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) lies in Arizona, Tucson Division.

Plaintiff and Defendants further agree that there is no basis for asserting claims under or based upon alleged violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act, against the individual defendants named in this case, pursuant to established Ninth Circuit precedent. *See Miller v. Maxwell's Int'l, Inc.*, 991 F.2d 583, 587 (9th Cir. 1993). Accordingly, the Parties agree that all individually named defendants – Stephen M. Bennett, Brad D. Smith, Jean-Paul Guilbault, Jenny Perry and Laura Mauler – should be dismissed from this action with prejudice.

Further, Defendant Intuit Inc. agrees that upon entry of the Orders set out below, and notice from the Court in the District of Arizona of completion of the transfer, Intuit Inc. will agree to waive the requirement of formal service of process pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(d).

- 2 -

Based on the foregoing, the Parties jointly request that the Court enter the following Orders:

1. Individuals who are not the employer cannot, as a matter of law, be liable

1	to Plaintiff for alleged violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Accordingly, Plaintiff	
2	claims against defendants Stephen M. Bennett, Brad D. Smith, Jean-Paul Guilbault, Jenny Perry	
3	and Laura Mauler are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.	
4	2. Venue is not proper in the Northern District of California. Rather, venue is	
5	proper in the District of Arizona. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a), the Court finds that transfer	
6	rather than dismissal serves the interests of justice. Therefore, the Court orders that the entire	
7	action shall be TRANSFERRED to the District of Arizona, Tucson Division.	
8	3. The Order entered September 21, 2007, ordering that the U.S. Marshals	
9	Service for the Northern District of California serve process and other papers on defendants, is	
10	VACATED. Intuit Inc. must waive service of process pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil	
11	Procedure 4(d) upon Notice that the transfer of this matter to the District of Arizona is completed	
12		
13	Dated: October 25, 2007  DANIEL J. BURKHART	
14	Plaintiff In Pro Se	
15		
16	Dated: October <u>30</u> , 2007 LYNNE C. HERMLE MICHAEL APARICIO	
17	Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP	
18		
19	MICHAEL A. APARICIO	
20	Attorneys for Defendant INTUIT INC.	
21		
22	<u>ORDER</u>	
23	Pursuant to Stipulation, IT IS SO ORDERED.  The Clerk shall transfer this action to the District of Arizona, Tucson Division and close this file.	
24	The Cierk shall transfer this action to the District of Arizona, Tueson Division and close this file.	
25	Dated: November 14, 2007	
26	JAMES WARE United States District Judge	
27	Cinica States District stage	
28		

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL**

I am more than eighteen years old and not a party to this action. My business address is Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP, 1000 Marsh Road, Menlo Park, California 94025. On October 30, 2007, I served the following document(s):

## STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER FOR DISMISSAL OF INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS AND TRANSFER OF CASE TO DISTRICT OF ARIZONA, TUCSON DIVISION

on the interested parties in this action by placing true and correct copies thereof in sealed envelope(s) addressed as follows:

Daniel J. Burkhart 9473 N. Albatross Drive Tucson, AZ 85742

I am employed in the county from which the mailing occurred. On the date indicated above, I placed the sealed envelope(s) for collection and mailing at this firm's office business address indicated above. I am readily familiar with this firm's practice for the collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. Under that practice, the firm's correspondence would be deposited with the United States Postal Service on this same date with postage thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on October 30, 2007, at Menlo Park, California.

Josette L. Romero